REMARKS

Claims 1-19, 41-59 and 81-88 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 41 and 81 are independent claims.

Applicants note that claims 20-40 and 60-80 are missing because the numbering of the original claims is not consecutive. By this amendment, misnumbered claims 1-19, 41-59 and 81-88 have been renumbered consecutively as claims 1-46 in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.126. After renumbering, claims 1-46 are pending in the application, claims 1, 20 and 39 are independent claims and no claims are missing. All references in the subsequent paragraphs are to the renumbered claims.

By this amendment, claims 1 and 19-46 have been amended. With respect to all of these amended claims, other than claims 1, 20 and 39, the amendments are made to correct typographical errors, conform to antecedent language or correct claim numbers or claim dependencies, and no narrowing amendments are intended. Support for claims 1, 20 and 39 as amended, can be found, for example, in connection with the description of Figs. 2 and 3, and on pages 7, and 8-11 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Specification

The Examiner noted that spacing of the lines of the specification is such as to make reading and entry of amendments difficult. A substitute specification with lines double spaced on good quality paper is submitted as requested by Examiner.

In the Claims

Applicant notes that the numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution.

By this amendment, misnumbered claims 1-19, 41-59 and 81-88 have been renumbered consecutively as claims 1-46 in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.126. After renumbering, claims 1-46 are pending in the application, claims 1, 20 and 39 are independent claims and no claims are missing. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because it contains the acronyms "HTML UI Control" which have not been previously defined. Claim 1 has been corrected to comply with this requirement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The Examiner has rejected originally numbered claims 41, 81, 84, 85, 87 and 88 under 35 USC § 112 noting that they recite the broad recitation "names," and the claim also recites "name" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation, the parentheses "(s)" leaving the term "name" indefinite.

Applicants have amended originally numbered claims 41, 81, 84, 85, 87 and 88 (corresponding to renumbered claims 20, 39, 42, 43, 45 and 46, respectively) to recite the broad recitation "at least one function name" thereby placing the claims in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the amended claims is requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-19, 41-59 and 81-88, corresponding to renumbered claims 1-19, 20-38 and 39-46, respectively, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by LiveWire Developer's Guide" (hereinafter "LiveWire").

While Applicants do not agree with this analysis, to advance prosecution Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 41 and 81 corresponding to renumbered claims 1, 20 and 39.

Each of claims 1, 20 and 39 as amended, recite a Client-Side Data Manager, a Client-Side Proxy, a Server-Side Proxy and a Server-Side Data Query Engine, not disclosed in LiveWire.

For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. § 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference in as complete detail as is contained in the claim and arranged as recited in the claim. Anticipation is not shown by a prior art disclosure which is only 'substantially the same' as the claimed invention. Applicants maintain that independent claims 1, 20 and 39 as amended *are not prima facie anticipated* by the art relied on in the Office Action.

Furthermore, LiveWire does not teach, suggest or motivate the use of a Client-Side Data Manager, a Client-Side Proxy, a Server-Side Proxy and a Server-Side Data Query Engine as claimed. The quotations from LiveWire in the context of anticipation do not provide any motivation for the use of a Client-Side Data Manager, a Client-Side Proxy, a Server-Side Proxy and a Server-Side Data Query Engine as claimed. All of the claim elements of amended claims 1, 20 and 39 are simply not taught or suggested by LiveWire. It is impermissible to simply engage in a hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention, using Applicants' structure as a template and selecting elements from references to fill the gaps. Therefore, LiveWire does not render Applicants' claimed subject matter *prima facie* obvious either.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 20 and 39 are in condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the rejection based on the above comments.

Dependent claims 2-19, 21-38, and 40-46 include all of the features and limitations of amended independent claims 1, 20 and 39. Therefore, these claims are patentable at least to the

same extent that independent claims 1, 20 and 39 are patentable.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Pedersen
Registration No. 32,432

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuente, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center·
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone:. (612) 349-5774